



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/823,472	03/30/2001	Thomas E. Willis	42390.P8930	6094
Jordan Michael Becker BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			EXAMINER	
			PORTKA, GARY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	5.6
Los Angeles, (CA 90025-1026		DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004	, 14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		<u></u>		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	licant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/823,472	WILLIS ET AL.		
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gary J Portka	2188		
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	er: (1) a timely filed amendmo ppeal (with appeal fee); or (3	s application. A proper replent which places the application	ition in	
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date or no event, however, will the statutory period for reply e ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a) fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the period of the control o	of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date expire later than SIX MONTHS from Y WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS. The date on which the petition underiod of extension and the corresponate of the shortened statutory period the Office later than three months after 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the mailing date of the final rejection. THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. Ider 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the apprincing amount of the fee. The apprincipality of the final reject the mailing date of the final reject.	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appel 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37)		9		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	red because:			
(a) they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see N	lote below);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicationissues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or sin	mplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without ca	anceling a corresponding nun	nber of finally rejected claim	s.	
NOTE:				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following r	rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	vould be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed	amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NO	T place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed So	OLELY to issues which were	e newly	

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ___

Gary J Portka Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2188

10. Other: ____

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-30 and 35-46.



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are directed to limitations not claimed; i.e., that the sharing indication is provided by the operating system. Examiner disputes this since no evidence was given but regardless considers this irrelevant to the single action of identifying if a translation is transparently sharable as recited, which has nothing to do with how or when it was set.